

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, and 23-38 are pending in the application. Claims 27-38 are new. Claims 1, 5 and 7 are currently amended, and claims 6 and 22 have been canceled without prejudice in the present amendment. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 12 and 22-26 were objected to as containing non-elected subject matter. Claim 1 was objected to as containing typographical errors. Claims 23 and 24 were objected to as being substantial duplicates of the claims from which they depend. Claims 7 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to meet the written description requirement.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions: the phrase "with the following provisos", which was intended to be recited but because of a typographical error was erroneously omitted from the previous amendment, is now recited in claim 1 and encompasses both provisos (a) and (b). Within proviso (b), numerals (v), (vi), (vii) and (viii) have been deleted. Moreover, references to heterocyclic substituents within the definition of G have been deleted; this amendment that effectively eliminates such substituents from all any other claims in the application. It is thus submitted that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 5, 6, 7, 23 and 24

The Examiner, citing MPEP 706.03(k), stated that claims 23 and 24 are "substantial duplicates of the claims from which they depend". Applicant disagrees. Claims 23 and 24 each depend from claim 1, and each recite a specific compound that falls within the genus of claim 1. Inasmuch as the genus recited in claim 1 includes compounds other than the compounds recited in each of claims 23 and 24, claims 23 and 24 do not "cover the same thing" as claim 1, and cannot reasonably be characterized as being "substantially duplicates" of claim 1 from which they depend.

Applicant notes that the Examiner referred in the objection to claims 5 and 7. Applicant therefore wonders if the Examiner meant to state that claims 23 and 24 are "duplicates" of claims

5 (or 6) and 7 respectively. However, if this is the case, then Applicant submits that the cited MPEP section is inapplicable, for the same reasons recited above: claims 5 (and 6) and 7, prior to the present amendments, recited groups of compounds that included compounds other than the compounds recited in claims 23 and 24, and therefore claims 23 and 24 did not “cover the same thing” as claims 5 and 7, and could not reasonably be characterized as being “substantially duplicates” of claims 5 and 7.

For reasons unrelated to the objection to claims 23 and 24 on the basis of MPEP 706.03(k), Applicant has (i) amended claim 5 to recite a single compound from the group of compounds originally recited in this claim, (ii) canceled claim 6, (iii) amended claim 7 to recite a pair of compounds from the group of compounds originally recited in this claim, and (iv) added new claims 27-38 that recite individual compounds. Most of claims 27-38 recite compounds that were previously recited in one of the groups of compounds listed in claim 5 or in claim 7. Support for each of new claims 27-38 can be found in the specification, *inter alia* in the examples, as follows:


Claim	Example	Claim	Example	Claim	Example
27	39	31	35	35	51
28	18	32	37	36	61
29	20	33	41	37	66
30	22	34	2	38	67

Inasmuch as each of claims 5, 7, 23, 24 and 27-38 is directed to a single compound or a pair of compounds, each of which falls within the genus of claim 1, it cannot be said that any of these claims is a "substantial duplicate" of claim 1 from which it depends, or that any of these claims are "substantial duplicates" of one another. (With respect to the compound appearing on the right in claim 7 and the compound recited in claim 24, the Examiner's attention is drawn to the fact that these compounds differ in the stereochemistry at the carbon bearing the hydroxyl group.) It is thus submitted that even if it assumed *arguendo* that the objection on the basis of MPEP 706.03(k) was proper, this objection has been mooted in view of the amendments now effected in the claims.

Furthermore, with the cancellation of claim 22, and the re-writing of claim 7 to once again depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph has been obviated.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully that the application is in condition for allowance. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Maureen Gibbons
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,121
Phone: 609-252-3453
Date: October 4, 2007

Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.
Patent Department
P. O. Box 4000
Princeton, NJ 08543-4000